

6.0 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

6.1 Scoping Process

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including Stakeholder meetings, agency coordination meetings and letters, and public meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

The remainder of this chapter discusses the public and agency involvement during the preparation of this document. Please refer to **Appendix G – Public and Agency Meetings and Coordination**, for public notifications, news articles, comments, and other information related to public and agency participation.

6.1.1 Public Scoping Meeting

A Public Scoping Meeting was held on Thursday, January 5, 2006 at the Washington City Council Chambers from 4:30 pm-7:00 pm with 90 visitors officially logged in on the sign-in sheet. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the project to the local community and allow them to submit comments regarding the project. The following items were presented:

- Meeting objectives
- NEPA project process
- Project schedule
- Project goals from Concept Report
- Opportunities to become involved
- Potential stakeholder group representatives
- Project contact information

Notification efforts included a paid advertisement in The Spectrum; a press release from Myron Lee, UDOT Region 4 Public Involvement Coordinator, resulting in a front page article in The Spectrum on January 1, 2006; mention in the Washington City Utility Bills; an advertisement in the Washington City Newsletter; and postings in local businesses along Telegraph Street.

Two reporters from KCSG Channel 4 – Aapree Hancey and Rosie Garcia attended the Public Scoping Meeting which resulted in news segments on both the English and Spanish news programs. Stephanie Coots, a reporter from The Spectrum produced an article which appeared in the January 6, 2006 issue.

Meeting attendees were asked to complete a comment form to identify transportation improvement needs within the project area and to suggest possible solutions. The following is a summary of comments received at the Public Scoping Meeting:

- Provide four lanes through the corridor
- Provide a light at Main Street
- Provide protected left turn signals at 300 East and Main Street
- Create easier pedestrian movement
- Build a new, wider bridge over Mill Creek
- Reduce travel speeds
- Provide the corridor with a well lit area
- Maintain historic sites
- Channel traffic away from Telegraph Street, new road to Washington Fields and Costco
- Provide better patrolling and enforcement
- Construct sufficient bike lanes
- Increase visibility (with brighter paint)
- Include a school crossing at 300 East
- Construct raised medians
- Improve turning radius
- Include a four-way stop at Main Street
- Provide bus service along Telegraph Street
- Create a new route heading north near Staheli Property
- Add a “No Left Turn” sign in the middle of 300 W, rather than on the side
- Construct a stoplight at 500 W
- Widen the east side of Telegraph Street
- Add more crosswalks
- Widen right turns
- Build a new crossover bridge (at the end of Mall Drive)

- Construct another road parallel to Telegraph Street
- Add left turn lanes at 100 South
- Do not widen to four lanes
- Eliminate risky entry points

6.2 Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies

6.2.1 Public Agency Coordination

Letters were sent to public agencies on February 23, 2006 to initiate dialogue with the Corps, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and the Utah Division of Water Rights. The letters included descriptions of the project study limits, project description, public and agency involvement activities and the proposed schedule. Dialogue was encouraged; however, to date no responses have been received from any of the above listed organizations.

6.3 Public Participation

6.3.1 Stakeholder Group

A stakeholder group was selected by the project team and invited to attend a series of meetings throughout the development of the EA. The stakeholder group was made up of approximately 30 members, including Washington City, UDOT, and FHWA staff; representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, Certified Local Government Program, Washington City School District, the City of St. George, Congressman Jim Matheson's office, Coral Canyon Development; residents; and business owners.

Throughout the development of the EA, the project team conducted three meetings at the Washington City Council Chambers. The first meeting introduced the stakeholders to the project and the Purpose and Need. The second meeting introduced the preliminary road design options and obtained input from the stakeholders about the materials to be presented at the Public Open House on June 1, 2006. The third meeting reviewed the alternatives and described the screening criteria necessary for selecting a preferred alternative.

6.3.2 Public Open House

The Telegraph Street Public Open House was held on June 1, 2006 at the Washington City Council Chambers from 4:00 pm -7:00 pm. Twenty six visitors attended the Open House. The purpose of the meeting was to present the public with the four alternatives and associated options. Comment forms were available for the public to record their thoughts regarding the various alternatives.

Notification efforts for the Open House included a press release from UDOT Region 4 Public Involvement Coordinator Myron Lee, which resulted in a front page article in The

Spectrum on June 1, 2006; an ad in the Washington City Newsletter; mention in the Washington City utility bills; and a paid ad in The Spectrum that ran on May 21 and May 28, 2006. A KCSG camera person attended the meeting, resulting in a news piece which aired on the evening of June 1, 2006.

The comment form requested specific comments about the individual alternatives and general suggestions of transportation improvement needs and possible solutions from the public regarding the project. The following is a list of comments received regarding the project in general:

- Widen streets and bridge
- Preserve historical sites
- Provide landscape enhancements
- Decrease traffic along Telegraph Street
- Control noise level
- Leave the corridor as is
- Increase speed limit
- Maintain pedestrian safety
- Do what is best for Telegraph Street (in the long term sense)

The following comments were made regarding the alternatives:

Alternative One:

- Connect road from the roundabout east of Washington to the road north of the freeway
- Too wide
- Do all the improvements at once. Islands, wider streets, etc.

Alternative Two:

- No comments

Alternative Three (Preferred Alternative):

- Flattening out the curve seems to have the less impact on businesses

Alternative Four:

- Not acceptable, it destroys neighborhood cohesion
- Residents near the split roads should be concerned with safety
- Trench the road at the T intersection at 300 East north and east until it intersects with eastbound traffic on the road north of Telegraph Street

6.3.3 Project Alternatives and Screening

A meeting was held on July 26, 2006 in Washington City, Utah with the Stakeholder Committee and the project team to discuss project alternatives and the screening process. The purpose of the screening process was to evaluate the four Build alternatives (including options) and the No Build alternative to determine a) which alternatives would be advanced for further analysis in the EA and b) establish the basis for identifying a preferred alternative.

Several screening criteria were presented and discussed. A more comprehensive discussion of alternatives and the screening process can be found in Chapter 2 – Alternatives.

6.3.4 Public Hearing

A Telegraph Street Public Hearing was held on Tuesday, December 18, 2007 in the Washington City Council Chambers from 4:00-7:00 pm. There were over 100 attendees at the Public Hearing. The purpose of the hearing was to present the Draft Environmental Assessment and Preferred Alternative to the public and to receive comments regarding each.

Comment forms were on hand for attendees to complete, with the option to leave it with a project team member at the Hearing, or complete it at a later time and mail it to the project team. Postage was available for the comment forms. Additionally, a court reporter from Van Fleet Court Reporting, Inc. was in attendance to record verbal comments.

Notification for the Public Hearing included a press release from UDOT Region 4 Public Involvement Coordinator Myron Lee, which resulted in a front page article in The Spectrum on December 18, 2007; an ad in the Washington City Newsletter; a paid advertisement in The Spectrum that ran on December 9, 2007 and December 16, 2007. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was posted in the Salt Lake Tribune and Deseret News on December 1 and 2, 2007 and December 10 and 11, 2007. The NOA was also posted in The Spectrum on December 1 and 2, 2007, and December 8 and 9, 2007. Flyers were posted in businesses along the Telegraph Street corridor during the week prior to the Public Hearing.

Caroline Christiansen, reporter from KCSG Channel 4, attended the Public Hearing and interviewed meeting attendees and members of the project team. A news segment aired on the 9 pm news on December 18, 2007. Alyson Van Deusen, reporter for The Spectrum, also conducted interviews at the Public Hearing, which resulted in a front page article in The Spectrum on December 19, 2007.

6.4 Comments and Responding to Comments

6.4.1 Public Comments Received During the Draft Environmental Assessment Public Comment Period

Public comments could be submitted by several methods including:

- The project website
- E-mail
- The public comment period (verbal and written)
- U.S. Mail

The comments received were then grouped into the following topics:

- Support for the Preferred Alternative
- Opposition to the Preferred Alternative
- Effects to Businesses
- Right-of-Way Acquisition
- Access and Raised Medians
- Lanes and Lane Width
- Pedestrian and Traffic Safety
- Historic Properties

A table of the comments received during the public comment period (December 1-December 31, 2007) and a response for each topic is presented in **Appendix G**.

There were no comments received that created a need to make changes to the Draft Environmental Assessment or Draft Section 4(F) Evaluation.